

to commit crime and who must be taught that it did not pay—perhaps a more intelligible assumption in the eighteenth century, when the facilities for detecting and proving crime were inadequate, than it seems to us. In reaction, the school of Lombroso believed that criminals belonged to a special physical type, and it is particularly interesting to eugenicists that Sir Francis Galton gave thought to this question, and selected for his first essays in composite portraiture persons who had been convicted of crimes of violence. As Sir Norwood East points out, Lombroso's theory implied that the criminal was predestined to crime, since he was not responsible for his physical appearance; it also implied that crime was hereditary, since almost all physical features can be inherited. The postulate of a criminal type has now been abandoned, and Sir Alexander Maxwell is quoted as saying that there is little outward difference between a group of prisoners and a group of ordinary people. Consistently with this Sir Norwood himself has found no reason to consider that criminality as such is transmissible.

But this does not negative any connection between crime and heredity. Goring, who reached "the inevitable conclusion that there is no such thing as a physical criminal type," had to admit that "the tendency to be convicted is influenced by the force of heredity," for there may be hereditary defects which conduce to crime. To give the obvious example, mental deficiency leads to crime and mental deficiency is to some extent hereditary: or physical defects making it difficult for a man to earn his living will be a temptation to him to live by dishonesty and such defects may be inherited. Sir Norwood remarks that "a greater degree of determinism should be accepted in some cases"—as when persons who even though they are capable of self-control feel a natural urge to commit sexual offences presenting no temptation to the ordinary man—and that "he would be a poor legal or medical therapist who disregarded inherited traits." We are given some interesting details

derived from studies of criminal twins, monozygotic and dizygotic, which seem to show the influence of hereditary factors on behaviour, though it may be objected that the number investigated was so small and there are so many other factors to be considered that the conclusion reached cannot be regarded as certain.

The book ends with a charming valedictory essay on human endeavour and, in particular, scientific research and the neglect with which it has too often been treated.

CECIL BINNEY.

Neumeyer, Martin H. *Juvenile Delinquency in Modern Society*. New York, 1949. Van Nostrand (London, Macmillan). Pp. 323. Price 20s.

THIS problem is, of course, one about which anxiety and controversy rage in all fields of study from the psychological to the legal. It sits fair and square on the shoulders of a Professor of Sociology, and the author holds this chair in the University of Southern California. His book deals with juvenile delinquency in modern society, with special reference to America and to California in particular.

The local implications do not in any way limit the scope of this book, which is a painstaking study and review of work done, especially in America and England, since Sir Cyril Burt and, later, Healy and Bronner produced their foundation stones of research into juvenile delinquency.

The work is divided into three parts. The first, of 58 pages, gives its name to the book. The second and longest is entitled "Basic Factors and Conditions of Juvenile Delinquency" and contains chapters covering the whole field of constitutional, psychological, social, environmental and legislative factors. The last section, of 100 pages, is entitled "Delinquency Control."

In the first conspectus Professor Neumeyer stresses the association of delinquency with "social disorganization." He points out the labile structure of urban society, and with it the inconstancy of social and parental standards or attitudes. There is still great

difficulty in overcoming lingering prejudices and misconceptions in the vulgar mind, and Lombroso's "criminal types" are still by no means only vulgarly believed. "Possession" is widely believed in and newspapers are much to blame for spreading false constructions. In places a rigid legal system treats juveniles as adults: and so the problem misses recognition or is further confused. Different approaches to the study of delinquency are examined in this section.

As far as the extent of delinquency is concerned, the author quotes the interesting finding that crime, both adult and juvenile, had started increasing in America before the late war began, and that as far as is known this war itself produced fluctuations but no pronounced trends. He considers the distribution and economic influences. In doing so he refers to Bogen's interesting, and almost paradoxical, findings that juvenile delinquency increased in times of prosperity and decreased during unemployment and distress.

Part two deals at length with the factors underlying delinquency. He does not understate the difficulty of this examination, and does not claim to exhaust the possible fields. He readily accepts the idea that multiple elements usually are at work in any case, and then considers these influences. He sees personality as a "product of the reciprocal relationship between the individual and the environment," though factors must necessarily be studied, and he refers largely to the Judge Baker *Foundation Case Studies* as material for his students. Mental conditions are reviewed and the author concludes that "only a small fraction of the delinquents suffer from extreme physical, mental or emotional handicaps; but a larger number are affected by one or several conditions of personality deviations that have a bearing on their conduct. It appears that, instead of being an innately weak, diseased or disordered group, delinquents are fairly normal individuals, some of whom have minor defects, but who have experienced stress-producing problems or are subjected to deviant influences."

Professor Neumeyer refers to the Kinsey Report for sexual statistics. He praises its

standard of research, but considers that "the investigators were apparently unable to live up to it" in their methods. He quotes the Glueck's findings, that time or maturation diminish the delinquent tendencies of the young adult.

Home influences are studied at length, and fresh attention is focused on the broken home that is physically intact. The author ascribes great blame to alcoholism in parents, as was first stressed by Healy and Bronner. He quotes case studies which show how interlocked are the home, external and internal lives of the delinquent. The gang or conspirator is found to be a frequent circumstance of trouble, few offences being committed alone. The great importance of supervised recreation as an alternative is shown, and schools and churches are often thought to be unsuccessful in providing this. The author asserts more than once that "Truancy is the Kindergarten of Crime." Among harmful commercial agencies the cinema and radio can rank extremely high. In other parts of the book the author suggests that the decrease of delinquency during economic distress may be due to the lessening of access to these things and their like.

America's peculiar difficulties with Negro and foreign subculture groups are considered; but these groups are shown to have very different delinquency rates in different parts of a city. Slums and "blighted areas" are obviously much to blame, but the author considers that social reformers are inclined to exaggerate their importance.

In summary, this section stresses the multifactorial origin and the interlocking of contributory causes, though a main factor may often be discovered.

The last section of the book is on delinquency control. It suggests many of the measures we already have in this country, such as the informal handling of much delinquency—a method that reduces "official action" to a very low figure and may stop many from becoming criminals. This, of course, matches well with Dr. Bowlby's observation that delinquency seems very low in this country among public-school boys—possibly because other than police methods

of dealing with it are in use. Juvenile courts, probation, welfare organizations are all supported. The English Borstal system receives its meed of praise. Appropriate institutions are, of course, needed, and Professor Neumeyer points out that conditional discharge should depend not on good marks earned in the institution—i.e. the child's adjustment to it—but on other bases covering rehabilitation after release. He recommends National and State organizations for research, prevention and control, as so many advocate in this country.

The book is thorough and it is up to date. It produces an orderly structure of research hitherto done, and has a final section of suggested research projects. It will be of great value to all who work in this field. It is hard reading, but is a good and timely reference book. It is a pity that the actual references to the work on the Jukes and Kallikak families are not given, and from page 196 onwards the page headings change sides. These are small blemishes on such a substantial whole.

REGINALD BENNETT.

Reiwald, Paul. *Society and Its Criminals.* (Translated by T. E. James.) London, 1949. Heinemann Medical Books. Pp. xix + 315. Price 21s.

THIS book is written by a lawyer who is a reader in criminology in the University of Geneva and practises in the criminal courts. He approaches the problem of crime with the aid of psychoanalysis.

Early in the book the author reminds us that education does not begin with the child but with the persons who bring him up, parents and teachers, and he considers that criminal psychology must turn from those who are punished, to society and its instruments who inflict the punishment. Although economic and other social conditions are, or may be, related to criminal activities the reader may be left with the impression that society is inevitably the guilty party and the asocial person constantly the victim.

Whatever truth there may be in the statement that in the majority of countries public opinion as a rule has been a great hindrance to the development of criminal law, and that science has retreated before this primitive attitude, we must insist that this is not applicable to Great Britain to-day. Those of us in this country who are in close contact with the modern approach to crime are aware of the progress made in the treatment of the criminal when the discipline of science is combined with the will to avoid a monopolist approach to the problem.

Many workers in this field will refuse to accept the author's view that society needs the criminal in order to abreast to its own unconscious emotions, that is to say, to work off its past disagreeable experiences. And many will reject the statement that the judge punishes himself in the person of the accused and that the offence of the accused may take the place of an "unconscious offence" of the judge. Further, when we are asked to believe that the judge punishes severely because punishment indicates fear and raises the question of self-punishment we are entitled to demand proof.

Reiwald considers that the resistance of the law to psychology is particularly vehement, and that it is so because psychoanalysis explains to the law-abiding members of society the similarity of their impulses to those of the asocial, and in so doing seems to cause a breach in the barriers between them. This will appear to some to disregard the fact that the law is concerned with realities and is not prepared to accept, without examination, opinions based upon unproved assumptions. The writer of this review has frequently observed at first hand that the judicial and executive authorities modify the award in the direction of clemency because they recognize that their restrained impulses are in many respects similar to the unrestrained impulses of the offender. They do not deny the value of the psychological approach, but they do reject assumptions based upon psychological extravagances.

The British reader will also dispute the author's statement that "the judge, the